<u>REMARKS</u>

The Non-Final Office Action, mailed July 13, 2007, considered claims 1-37. Claims 1, 3, 16, 17, 19, 32 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leen et al., (US 6,899,628) in view of Knepfle et al. (WO 200161601 A1). Claims 2, 4-12, 14-15, 18, 20-28, 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.5.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leen in view of Knepfle and further in view of Michael Bacarella's "Anti-Cheat Mechanisms-Limited Trust in Online Gaming Communities (Bacarella). Claims 13 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leen, in view of Knepfle and Bacarella, and further in view of Zacharia et al., "Collaborative Reputation Mechanisms in Electronic Marketplaces" (Zacharia).[1]

By this amendment claims 1, 17 and 32 have been amended.[2] Claims 1-37 are pending, of which claims 1, 16, 17, 32 and 37 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to determining an official result for an online game session when the validity of the official result is in dispute. For example, claim 1 defines automatically establishing a trust rating for each player connected to an online gaming service and participating in an online game session where the session involves a disagreement about the official results of the session, the trust rating being based on information associated with each player collected during the session, the trust rating being further configurable to be updatable when players participate in successive online game sessions. Next, claim 1 defines receiving alleged results for the online game session from the computer systems of the online game players participating in the online game session. Lastly, claim 1 defines determining the official result for the online game session, based on a function of the alleged online game session results reported by the players' computer systems and the trust ratings of each player participating in the online game session as indicated by the online game service based on prior involvement in online game sessions where the session involved a dispute over the official results.

Claim 16 is a computer program product claim corresponding to claim 1. Claim 17 is a system claim similar to claim 1. Claim 32 is a method claim for establishing a level of trust in a computer gaming service. Claim 37 is a computer program product claim corresponding to claim 32. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise

---

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.
[2] Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to p. 5, l. 3 – p. 4, l. 13; p. 19, ll. 21-28; p. 22, ll. 2-10 and Figures 4 & 6.

render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

Leen describes a client system that provides enhanced services for a gaming application such as event management, statistics generation, user profiling, providing game advice, placing wages on games, and others (Col. 3:15-28). *Leen* monitors event information and keeps statistics regarding each of the players including which moves were made and the timing of each move made. Other statistics include a wins and losses record for each user. These statistics recorded from past games can be compared to statistics gathered in a current game to determine whether the player is cheating (Col. 8:46-53). Applicants assert that *Leen* actually teaches away from a trust-based system, citing such a trust-based system in the background as a drawback to current systems that needed to be overcome (Col. 1:26-30). Column 19:35-40 further teach that *Leen*'s system is designed to overcome the drawbacks of a trust-based system.

Knepfle teaches a system for establishing trust among members. *Knepfle* describes eBay's user feedback system where each user involved in a transaction is permitted to leave feedback regarding the other user that affects how the user is viewed within the system. The more positive feedback left for a user, generally the more the user will be trusted by other eBay users. The eBay rating system, however, relies on the inputs of users. Without user inputs, the eBay system would have no trust system. Furthermore, the rating system is not used by eBay itself – it is provided by eBay to allow users to establish trust amongst themselves. The eBay users associate the trust with each other – the eBay system does not associate trust with anyone.

Thus, the cited art fails to teach or suggest (and, at least in the case of the *Leen* reference, teaches away from) automatically establishing a trust rating for each player connected to an online gaming service and participating in an online game session where the session involves a disagreement about the official results of the session, the trust rating being based on information associated with each player collected during the session, the trust rating being further configurable to be updatable when players participate in successive online game sessions, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, none of the cited art teaches or suggests determining the official result for the online game session, based on a function of the alleged online game session results reported by the players' computer systems and the trust ratings of each player participating in the online game session as indicated by the online game service based on prior involvement in online game sessions where the session involved a dispute over the official results, as recited in claim 1. At

least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 16, 17, 32 and 37 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 16, 17, 32 and 37, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 15th day of October, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
MICHAEL B. DODD
Registration No. 46,437
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:MBD:GRL:ds
DS0000008013V001